



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,525	07/26/2001	Stepan Sokolov	SUN-P6265-MEG	1168
22835	7590	08/29/2005	EXAMINER	
A. RICHARD PARK, REG. NO. 41241 PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP 2820 FIFTH STREET DAVIS, CA 95616			VO, LILIAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2195	

DATE MAILED: 08/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/917,525	Applicant(s) SOKOLOV ET AL.	
Examiner Lilian Vo	Art Unit 2195	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 - 3, 5 - 10 and 12 - 14 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 - 3, 5 - 10 and 12 - 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 - 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 10 and 12 – 14 are pending. Claims 4, 11 and 15 - 21 have been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 6 – 8 and 13 – 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Summer, Jr. et al. (US 4,414,624, hereinafter Summer) in view Bayeh (US 6,223,202).

4. Regarding **claim 1**, Summer discloses a method to facilitate suspending tasks/threads in a platform-independent virtual machine implemented on an operating system that lacks a global mechanism for suspending tasks/threads, comprising:

scheduling a task/thread to execute that requires other tasks/threads to be suspended during execution (col. 15, lines 3 – 22); and

in response to scheduling the thread (col. 15, lines 8 – 10),

changing a scheduling policy for the task/thread (col. 15, lines 1 – 19); and

Art Unit: 2195

raising a priority of the task/thread to a highest available priority, whereby changing the scheduling policy and raising the priority of the task/thread causes the thread to run to completion while other tasks/threads do not run (col. 15, lines 3 – 22).

Summer however did not use the term threads. Instead, he uses the term tasks, which is partitioned from the whole program (col. 4, lines 9 – 11 and fig. 1). It would have been obvious for one of an ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to relate the concept of a task with the concept of a thread, since the task as referred to in Summer is also a part of the program that can be executed independently of the other parts like a thread.

With respect to the limitation changing the scheduling policy for the thread includes changing the scheduling policy from round-robin to first-in-first-out, which guarantees that the thread will run to completion without being interrupted by an event timer mechanism, Summer discloses of preemptive scheduling (col. 14, lines 37 – 39 and col. 15, lines 12 – 17) which also called time-slice scheduling, and that a task priority can change to a higher priority and interrupt the current execution task which allow it to run to completion before switching to another task (col. 15, lines 1 – 17). Additionally, Bayeh discloses the operating system maintains information about each concurrent thread that enables the threads to share the CPU in time slices (col. 2, lines 44 – 50, col. 11, lines 15 - 19) and that if the operating system invokes garbage collection, then execution of application programs to process client requests will halt until the garbage collection is finished (col. 3, lines 3 –6, col. 11, lines 40 - 45). It would have been obvious for one of an ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate Bayeh's teaching together with Summer so that scheduling of threads/tasks with higher priority can be performed effectively with changing from one policy (time slice) to another policy (FIFO) as appropriated.

Art Unit: 2195

5. Regarding **claim 6**, as modified Summer discloses the platform-independent virtual machine includes a Java Virtual Machine (Bayeh: col. 2, lines 1 – 65).

6. Regarding **claim 7**, as modified Summer discloses the step of performing a garbage collection with the thread (Bayeh: col. 3, lines 3 – 6, col. 11, lines 40 – 45).

7. **Claims 8, 13 and 14** are rejected on the same ground as stated in claims 1, 6 and 7 above.

8. Claims 2 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Summer, Jr. et al. (US 4,414,624, hereinafter Summer) in view Bayeh (US 6,223,202), as applied to claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of Cutler et al. (US 5,752,031, hereinafter Cutler).

9. Regarding **claim 2**, as modified Summer did not clearly disclose the additional limitation as claimed. Nevertheless, Cutler discloses the step of upon completion of the thread, reducing the priority of the thread to an assigned priority and returning the scheduling policy of the thread to an assigned scheduling policy (col. 9, lines 29 – 44: each thread also has a dynamic priority). It would have been obvious for an ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to incorporate Cutler's teaching with Summer and Bayeh so that a thread priority can be dynamically changed as necessary depending on the type of the work the thread is performing.

10. **Claim 9** is rejected on the same ground as stated in claim 2 above.

Art Unit: 2195

11. Claims 3, 5, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Summer, Jr. et al. (US 4,414,624, hereinafter Summer) in view Bayeh (US 6,223,202), as applied to claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of Applicants' admitted prior art (hereinafter AAPA).

12. Regarding **claim 3**, as modified Summer discloses the thread requiring other threads to be suspended (Summer: col. 15, lines 3 – 11). Summer and Bayeh however did not disclose the suspended threads include a garbage collection thread. Nevertheless, AAPA discloses that while the other threads are halted, the garbage collection or other uninterruptible task runs to completion (specification page 2, paragraph 5). It would have been obvious for one of an ordinary skill in the art to recognize that if the other uninterruptible task that runs to completion, then the collection garbage thread could be included as one of the other threads that were suspended. It would have been obvious for one of an ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate AAPA concept with Summer and Bayeh so that any threads/tasks can be executed until completion as required or be suspended when necessary.

13. Regarding **claim 5**, as modified Summer did not disclose the additional limitation as claimed. Nevertheless, AAPA discloses the operating system that lacks the global mechanism for suspending threads includes POSIX (specification page 2, paragraphs 3 and 5). It would have been obvious for an ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate Agape's teaching with modified Summer because Summer is implemented with virtual machines (fig. 2) while operating systems with POSIX thread also include the same basics services to those platform-independent machines.

14. **Claims 10 and 12** are rejected on the same ground as stated in claims 3 and 5 above.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed 6/22/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the reasons set forth below.

16. With respect to applicant's remark that Summer teaches using an event timer, which removes the present event and starts the next available event in col. 14, lines 16 – 31 (page 6, 7th paragraph), this citation is not used anywhere in the office action. Furthermore, the use of an event timer in this citation refers to the execution of general tasks other than high priority tasks which is when a task priority change to a higher priority that allow it to run to completion before switching to another task (col. 15, lines 1 – 17).

17. With respect to applicant's argument that there is nothing within Summer or Bayeh, either separately or in concert, which suggests changing the scheduling policy from round-robin to FIFO, to guarantee that the thread will run to completion without being interrupt by an event timer mechanism (page 7, 1st paragraph), the examiner disagrees. Summer discloses that a task priority can change to a higher priority and interrupt the current execution task which allow it to run to completion before switching to another task (col. 15, lines 1 – 17). Additionally, Bayeh discloses the operating system maintains information about each concurrent thread that enables the threads to share the CPU in time slices (col. 2, lines 44 – 50, col. 11, lines 15 - 19) and that if the operating system invokes garbage collection, then execution of application programs to

Art Unit: 2195

process client requests will halt until the garbage collection is finished (col. 3, lines 3 –6, col. 11, lines 40 - 45). In other words, higher priority thread/task (in the case of Summer) and the garbage collection thread instead of waiting for its time slice (round-robin) is change to a higher priority (FIFO) when being invoked by the OS to execute to completion (in the case of Bayeh). Therefore, either Summer or Bayeh alone or in combination clearly suggests such teaching.

Furthermore, Summer and Bayeh are used in the rejection to provide support for the limitation of changing the scheduling policy from round-robin to FIFO, to guarantee that the thread will run to completion without being interrupt by an event timer mechanism. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually (page 6, 7th paragraph), one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

18. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2195

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lilian Vo whose telephone number is 571-272-3774. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 7:30am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist at 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lilian Vo
Examiner
Art Unit 2127

lv
August 22, 2005

MENG-AI AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100